THE CONFESSIONAL BASIS FOR A REUNITED CHURCH

As Proposed by the Movement for a "World Conference on Faith and Order"

J. L. NEVE

Historical Review

Since 1888, the Lambeth Anglican Conference[1] has been discussing Christian unity, and a large literature on this subject has been published under the sanction of these conferences. In 1920 the Episcopal Church in America, in session at Cincinnati, Ohio, adopted a resolution to work for a "World Conference on Faith and Order," in which the union of Christendom is to be considered and, if possible, consummated.

The Cincinnati resolution was passed under influence from the World Mission Conference that had been held in Edinburgh, Scotland. At that conference, according to program, the discussions excluded all questions of faith and church organization. But this had created in many participants the feeling that even in the foreign field, united action

---

*Address delivered at the opening of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, 1921.

[1] "Lambeth" is a part of the City of London, opposite Westminster, with a palace of the Archbishop of Canterbury of like name, in which since the time of Queen Elizabeth, conferences of bishops of the Anglican Church have been held.

must rest on a certain amount of agreement in matters of faith and church organization. This was the motive for the resolution passed in Cincinnati. It put new life into the Anglican unity movement of the Lambeth Conferences. A donation of $100,000 from Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan furnished the means for it to function immediately, with an office in care of Mr. R. H. Gardiner, in Gardiner, Maine, as a center of an active literary propaganda. The "Constructive Quarterly," under the editorship of Mr. Silas McBee, put itself into the service of this movement.

Conventions, to which all Churches were invited, have been held. The Orthodox Eastern Churches of Russia, Servia, Greece, as also the separated Churches of the East, the Jacobites of West Syria, the Armenians, the Copts and Abyssinians and the Christians of St. Thomas in Malabar were approached by delegations. An attempt was also made to interest the Pope and other Roman Catholic dignitaries. From this quarter, however, there came a characteristic counter-invitation, namely "that all who are enrolled in the name of Christians should betake themselves to the bosom of the one most loving Church." The crown of all these preparatory efforts came when the Lambeth Conference of 1920, in the name of 252 bishops, issued an "Encyclical Letter" addressed to "the Faithful in Christ Jesus" and an "Appeal to all Christian People" for a Church union, and when at the same time (August 12-20) a "Preliminary Meeting" for the World Conference on Faith and Order was held in Geneva, Switzerland[2].

---

[2]We refer to the "Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the Resolutions and Reports published by the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge, London; also by the MacMillan Co., New York. See also the "Report of the Preliminary Meeting in Geneva:" also the article by Dr. A. W. Schneider, Berlin, on "*Internationale Kirchliche Einheitbestrebungen*" in the *Allgemeine Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung* (Leipzig), 1920, No. 51, pp. 941 f. See also the excellent report of Dean Dr. D. H. Bauslin to the forty-eighth convention of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America, 1917. *Proceedings*, pp. 121-128.

The conclusion of the great World War, with England as chief factor among the victors, was bound to give an additional impulse to this Episcopalian movement for Church Unity. The State Church of England with its bishops in the House of Commons has been growing in influence with the expansion of the British Empire, and in this hour of reconstruction in State and Church throughout the world it starts out in new efforts at reuniting the divided Christian Church.[3] At the time when the convention was to take place in Geneva there appeared in the London Morning Post an article in which the following is found: "The Anglican State Church is especially adapted to bring together the scattered members of the Catholic Christian Church. But in order to do it, it is necessary first to bring itself into one communion with the dissenters of England. She must cultivate a spirit of friendly union with the Scandinavian Churches.[4] She must learn to draw to herself all Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches. She must take every opportunity to establish relations with the Greek Orthodox Church and with the other Churches of the East. At the present time there is no prospect of a reunion with the Roman Catholic Church, which, however, needs not always to remain so."

---

[3]Read the Reports of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 on "Reunion," pp. 145-151.

[4]On this point the "Resolutions" of the late Lambeth Conference are interesting to Lutheran readers. While the Moravians cannot yet be recognized on account of their administration of Confirmation and the Holy Communion by deacons (p. 34, cf. 157f.), the members of the Church of Sweden, because of its "Succession of the Bishops" and "the conception of the priesthood," are to be admitted to the Holy Communion in the Episcopalian Church. It is recommended "that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches." Permission is also given to Episcopal bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish bishop (p. 33, cf. p. 153.) The fact that the Swedish Church is Lutheran in doctrine while the Episcopal Church represents a middle position between Geneva and Rome seems to be a matter of no interest.

Four Questions

We come now to the chief purpose of our address, namely, a discussion of four questions concerning a confessional basis for a reunited Church. A few remarks on how these questions originated will be of interest. The convention at Geneva, to which we have referred, decided that a World Conference on Faith and Order, such as proposed by the Episcopalians, should be held. A "Continuation Committee" was appointed to make arrangements. This committee, again, appointed a "Subjects Committee" which from time to time, with the sanction of the Continuation Committee, will issue series of questions for discussion throughout the world. The first of these deals with Faith and Creed in relation to the reunited Church. The second series will deal with Orders considered in the same relation. The third will deal similarly with Sacraments. Possibly the fourth will deal with the existing organization of the Churches in relation to corporate union. This is the announcement of Bishop Palmer as chairman of this "Subjects Committee."[5] We received this first series of four questions, published in a folder of four pages in four languages (English, French, German and Greek), a little less than a year ago with the wish that the contents be discussed in conferences and that the results be reported to "the Right Reverend the Bishop of Bombay, Malabar Hill, India."

The questions are:

1. What degree of unity in Faith will be necessary in a reunited Church?

2. Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable?

3. If so, what Creed should be used? or what other formulary would be desirable?

4. What are the proper uses of a Creed and of a Confession of Faith?

---

[5]Constructive Quarterly, March 1921, p. 4.

As Lutherans we cannot help but appreciate the plan of the Subjects Committee to begin these discussions with questions concerning unity "in the Faith." Faith and confession of the Faith is fundamental to the life of the Church. Christ, in His great prayer (John 17), said: "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy Word is truth." The Church of Christ upon earth must be established upon the truth of God's Word. It is therefore right that the matter of unity in the Faith should have first consideration when the union or, as the Episcopalians prefer to say, "unity," of the Church is discussed. However, there are elements that dampen our appreciation, among which, at this time, we mention that this union movement of the Episcopalians goes under the title "Faith *and Order*." Orders and questions of organization must never be co-ordinated with Faith as condition for Church union. On this subject we confess in Article VII, of the Augsburg Confession: "And to the true unity of the Church, it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men, should be everywhere alike. As Paul says: 'One Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all.'"[6] But we can dismiss this matter because in all questions of this first series the interest is to be centered upon Faith and Creed alone.

I.

We shall, then, begin with the first question: *"What degree of unity in the Faith will be necessary in a reunited Church?"* This question brings up before us a problem that is as old as are the endeavors for the union of the divided Christian Church. We may say that the Augsburg Con-

[6] In Article V also we read of an "office of teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments." There is no mention here of a third thing as co-ordinated with these two, namely the commission to lead and to guide. It is true that this also belongs to the minister's work, but it is subordinated, and as such it is dealt with in the second part of the Confession, in articles 28 and 25.

fession was formulated for the purpose of stating and formulating the matters in which Evangelical Christians should be in agreement. Most Creeds have been drafted for the purpose of stating the "degree of unity in the Faith" necessary to unite the Church. George Calixtus, in the seventeenth century, for sixty years professor in the old Helmstedt University, spent his whole academic life in defining the fundamentals for Church union.[1] Then, as a parallel movement with the Evangelical Alliance, there came the consensus theologians of the Prussian Church Union with their arguments on fundamentals and non-fundamentals, and following them the men of the "American Lutheranism" in the old General Synod. It was always the question "What degree of unity in the Faith" is necessary for Church Union?

But there is a special suggestion connected with this question as it has been formulated by the movement for a World Conference on Faith and Order. The last Lambeth Conference suggested as the Confessional Basis for the reunited Church: "The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief." We cannot here enter into a discussion of what, in the light of past deliverances of the Lambeth Conferences, this reference to the Scriptures may mean. If we think of the many Churches, communions and sects which this union wants to embrace, especially when we think of the strong influence of liberalism in many of them, then we can imagine how little such a "whole-hearted" acceptance of the Scriptures means. We wish here to call attention to the fact that nothing more than what is expressed in the Nicene Creed is to be used as the public confession for the Union. This is not enough for the Church of today. In the historical Creeds, that is, in those that are in line with the true development of the Church

[1] See Neve, The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union, 1921, pp. 81-109.

in comprehending the teaching of the Scriptures, we have actual religious experiences of the Church. Christ promised His followers that the Holy Spirit should lead them into all truth. In addition to the religious experience of the ancient Church respecting the Trinity and Christology, after having received the impulses from the historical conflict between Augustine and Pelagius on the great subject of sin and grace, the Church has had a large experience in Soteriology. We may say that the whole mediæval age is one long drawn-out cry for an answer to the question: "What shall I do to be saved?" In Luther's experience of justification by faith and the matters connected therewith the matured answer to that question was found. This religious experience of the Church in the age of the Reformation is too much ignored in the Lambeth appeal for Church unity. This is the other element that dampens our appreciation of the decision of the Subjects Committee of giving first place to a discussion of the relation of Faith to union.

The fundamental mistake of this movement is that it apologizes for the Reformation and does not take the errors of the Roman Catholic Church seriously. At a convention for preparation held in Gardiner City, L. I., 1916, a leading representative of the Presbyterian commission declared: "Presbyterians have no apology to offer for the Reformation" —a remark which we Lutherans must endorse. Neither do we see how we could dismiss as a matter of indifference the differing comprehension of the Scriptures as it came to light in the conflict between the Lutheran and the Swiss Reformation. The revelation of the Scriptures is for man's salvation. *All of it* is for that purpose. There are no doctrines of Scripture that can be regarded as indifferent. It is not true that God has given in the Scriptures a certain number of fundamental doctrines on which the Church of Christ is to agree and then again other "non-fundamental" doctrines, also in the Scriptures, on which we, as members of the Church of Christ, may have our personal opinions. Paul expressed it as the goal of the Church that " we all come in the unity of the

faith" (Eph. 4:13). In this the true Christians in all Churches may so far not have succeeded, but until they have succeeded they must not proceed to the point of union. The Lutheran Church will never enter into a union that does not rest upon agreement with regard to the doctrinal differences between Rome and the Reformers, between Wittenberg and Geneva.

II.

We can now proceed to the second question: *"Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable?"*

This question has evident regard to the well-known position of the Disciples: "No Creed, but Christ." They say: "The Bible alone is our Creed." "Since all agree that the Scriptures contain the Word of God, why could not the Scriptures alone be sufficient?" They point to the early Church and say that it could exist without creeds.

There are a number of reasons why this position cannot be maintained: (1) There is in the Church of Christ an inner impulse which leads to a confession of the faith in formulated statements in order that there may be an expression of union in the faith and so that the Church can satisfy itself as to who is in agreement with this Faith and who is not, who is brother and who is opponent, who will co-operate in building and whose influence will be destructive and scattering. (2) The Scriptures cannot take the place of a Creed. In the Creed we have an authoritative interpretation on the Scriptures in matters fundamental to the Church's life. Adoption by a Church of the Scriptures and at the same time refusing to interpret them confessionally, as a bond of union, is a negative or neutral and not a positive adoption. (3) At an early time, the Church, in its conflicts with error, was forced to guard the words of the Lord and the teachings of the Apostles against misinterpretation. The Gnostics were the first exegetes of the New Testament writings and they justified their errors by the Scriptures. The Church had to lay down leading prin-

ciples of truth. We have the results of such unconscious creed-making in the Rules of Faith which gradually issued into the ecumenical Creeds. (4) While it is to be deplored that in the doctrinal controversies of the ages there has been much sinning against the commandment of Christian love—this comes from the weakness of the flesh—yet God has overruled much of such evil, and in great historical moments He has used the doctrinal controversies to give to the Church new experiences in the truth of His Word, which now could be expressed in Creeds that succeeded in bringing to expression what a preceding age was utterly incapable of doing. The Augsburg Confession presents such a case. When on that 25th of June, 1530, that document was read before Emperor Charles V at Augsburg, the confessors of the Gospel at that diet were convinced that they had witnessed a great moment in the Church's history. Spalatin, one of Luther's co-laborers, wrote: "This was a day that witnessed one of the greatest events that have ever taken place on this globe. A confession has been delivered, in Latin and German, so Scriptural in character as the world has not heard the like of in a thousand years." And Luther, when he heard of it in Coburg, rejoiced that he had been permitted to see the day when the words of the Psalmist (119:46) had been fulfilled: "I will speak of Thy testimonies also before kings and will not be ashamed."

The statement of the Church's Faith in the form of a Creed is not only desirable, but necessary. An army needs a flag, so does the Church need a Creed. The non-creedal churches have certain denominational peculiarities on which they do so much preaching and writing that these utterances stand out in the memory of their members as a kind of a substitute for a formulated Creed.

III.

The third question reads as follows: *"If so"* (that is, if the statement of the Faith in the form of a Creed is necessary), *"what Creed should be used?"*

Bishop Palmer, chairman of the Subjects Committee, in

an article of the *Constructive Quarterly* (March, 1921) gives us a little history on the origination of this question, which is of interest. At that convention in Geneva, the question of a Creed for a reunited Church was discussed in sessions attended by the representatives of many Churches. He reports as follows: "This debate was throughout relevant, valuable and illuminating. Four characteristic types of opinions defined themselves clearly. (a) Some insisted that the reunited Church must adopt the Nicene Creed as the primary Creed of the Church, though there would be no objection to the use of the Apostles' Creed for certain purposes. (b) Some would have the Apostles' Creed but not the Nicene. (c) Others agreeing that there must be some Creed, demanded a modern formulation of the essential belief of the Church, and added that it must not go farther than: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is Lord.' (d) The fourth type of opinion was opposed to any man-made words being placed in the position historically held by the creeds."

We have already heard of the position taken by the Lambeth Conference on this matter, namely that it should be "the Creed commonly called the Nicene as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal confession of belief."[a] We as Lutherans agree that the Nicene and the Apostles' Creed cannot be omitted from the confessional basis of the Church. But there must be more. We gave the reason for this in another connection and shall say it again: Insistence upon the Nicene and the Apostles' Creeds only excludes a great sphere of confessional interest, namely the whole conflict between Augustinianism and Pelagianism, the conflict between Semi-Pelagianism and the doctrine of sin and grace as taught by the Reformers. And it would give us no confessional statements on the means of grace, on which Luther and the leaders of the Reformed Churches failed to find an understanding. These great posi-

[a] See Resolutions, p. 28 also Christian Union Quarterly, 1920, p. 91; Constructive Quarterly, Dec. 1920, p. 531.

tive experiences of the Reformation age can never be left as "open questions."

There are those to whom even the Nicene and the Apostles' Creed offer too much as a Confession of Faith. In Germany where the struggle between the historical Faith and a new Faith has been so intense, some attention has been given to the suggestion of gathering into one communion all true worshippers of Christ, irrespective of their attitude to creeds and to the details of the Faith, under the watchword: "Jesus Christ is our Lord!"[9] But the suggestion has been rejected because that phrase was accepted also by those rejecting Christ's pre-existence, His resurrection, return for judgment, and His reign in the world to come. As a confessional basis for Church union the phrase is utterly unsatisfactory. When the Hindu speaks of God, meaning Brahma, then we cannot step into religious fellowship with him just because we also speak of God. Christian union must rest upon agreement in the *matter* of Christian belief, not merely upon its form.

What would prevent a world conference for Church Union from making a new Creed? We need not waste many words on this question. Imagine a conference composed as this world conference would be. In Geneva there were assembled representatives of about forty nations and seventy autonomous Churches. Then keep in mind the conflicting theological positions ranging from stiff orthodoxy down to radical liberalism. Would such a conference be able to make a new Creed? The Augsburg Confession begins its first article with the words: "Our Churches do teach with great unanimity" (*magno consensu*)! At modern conventions for Church union the boast is in the diversity of individual opinions which are spoken of as "graces" and even as "charisms." It can easily be seen that in such atmosphere the elementary conditions for creed-making are absent.

We have to close the discussion of this question without being able to name a Creed or to suggest a Creed that would

[9] See the very interesting article on this subject in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (Leipzig), 1920, numbers 27-29.

be able to unite into one communion all the elements that this World Movement for Faith and Order is aiming to bring together.

IV.

The last question is: *"What are the proper uses of a Creed and of a Confession of Faith?"*

This is a very practical question. Bishop Palmer, in his article in the *Constructive Quarterly* observes correctly that deciding on a Creed for a reunited Church has much to do with the question "what uses the united Church will make (or allow to be made) of Creeds." Let us present this part of our discussion in a few distinct thoughts:

1. It is possible to use a form or forms of the objective Faith, that is a Creed or Confession,
union, without being very particular about the contents and the real principles expressed by that Confession. To illustrate, let me say: The Nicene and the Apostles' Creed have definite expressions on the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, which cannot be evaded if these are taken in their historical meaning. But among those that are willing to enter into the union here under discussion there are many who do not believe in the doctrines professed by the Nicene Creed. They prefer to stand upon the vagaries and ambiguities of modern theology and to be bound by no Creed. And yet, they do not greatly object to a Creed like the Nicene as a *"symbol of unity."* It is to them merely a symbol of the historical origin of the uniting Churches. One of the bishops of the Episcopal Church, Dr. Burge of Oxford, in an article on the "Context of the Lambeth Appeal and Resolutions"[10] writes with reference to the confessional basis: "The Creed does not impose a test, but is offered and accep
of unity and as a witness to the name which the Church of Christ claims." This is not the right use of a Creed. While we do call the creeds symbols, they are not symbols in that

[10]Constructive Quarterly, June 1921, p. 238.

sense. When Churches unite upon a common confessional basis their interest must be centered in the principles of the Creed which they accept.

2. There is another conception of the Creed, which is very much akin to the one that we have just mentioned. At one of the conferences held for organic union in Philadelphia a representative of the Congregationalists said: "The historic creeds need not be repudiated. They are honored monuments of the faith of our fathers and witnesses to the apprehension of Christianity of those in spiritual succession to whom we gladly stand."[11] This is not altogether wrong. The Formula of Concord also says that the symbols "are not judges as are the Holy Scriptures, but only a witness and declaration of the Faith as to how and at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained . . . by those who then lived."[12] But the mistake begins when we take the Creeds to have nothing but historical significance. The Formula soon proceeds to tell us why the Symbols are "accepted." It is "because" (*quia*) they agree with the Scriptures.[13] The Church as represented especially by its teachers and leaders has arrived at this conclusion. If the Creed to be adopted is nothing but an honored monument of the faith of the fathers, a kind of embalmed quantity, like an Egyptian mummy, for the sages to look upon occasionally, then we utterly fail to see what relation the Creed has to the life of the Church. It is when the principles of a Creed claim validity for the Church in this present day and are to be subscribed to and carry with themselves an obligation that the matter of Creed becomes the most delicate feature in proceedings for Church Union.

3. What is the practical use of the Creed in the Church? A Creed or a Confession of Faith is an expression of the

[11]See Christian Union Quarterly, April, 1919, p. 46.

[12]Introduction to Part 1, Sec. 8.

[13]Cf. Jacobs, "People's Edition of the Book of Concord," p. 536f.

special comprehension of the Gospel for which the Church has decided. This comprehension of the Gospel or interpretation of the Scriptures is to aid the Church in its great work of feeding and leading the souls unto salvation. The Creed of a Church will be a doctrinal guide for the ministers in the pulpit, it will shape the catechism and the Sunday school literature to be used for the instruction of the young, it furnishes leading principles to the editors of Church papers and to the Theological Seminaries, especially in doctrinal and practical theology. Who can measure the influence which, for instance, the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism have had upon the teaching and the piety of the Lutheran Church? Our age with its almost fanatical aversion to dogma, creed and doctrine would do well to recall the uncountable blessings, which the Church has received from this so much despised source.

4. It is the creedal subscription that is so much detested and the idea that a minister after his ordination can be held accountable for his teaching. There must be freedom of thought, it is claimed; the Spirit cannot be bound; confessional obligation makes hypocrites, etc. But let us try for a moment to weigh these objections in the light of the following considerations: The Church, like an individual, has a distinct life. This life manifests itself through its doctrine, cultus polity and piety. But the doctrinal element is fundamental. It is the source out of which the others receive their strength. If this is admitted then we must also admit that the Church cannot be indifferent to the teaching in its pulpits and in its schools of prophets.

It is certainly not moral for any man to continue in the service of the Church when by his teaching he destroys the foundations and the life of the Church. The author of the article on "Orthodoxy" in the "R. E."[14] says very fittingly: "On this there can be no doubt that he is an unhappy man who teaches doctrines against his inner conviction; also that he

[14] Hauck's *Protestantische Realencyclopaedie*, XIV, p. 496, 38.

is a dishonest man, who uses his office for the work of undermining and to attack the Confession of his Church." It is one use of the Creed to make a false teacher feel in his own conscience that he is not doing his duty.

Cases may also arise where the Church itself is justified in using the Creed for its own protection. As an organization is protected by its constitution so is the life of the Church protected by its Creed as the fundamental paragraph of its constitution. We know that this is language which many dislike to hear. People of the world outside of the Church and heretically inclined teachers within the Church are censuring the Church for intolerance and persecution. This is an unfounded accusation! The fact is that even in our Church, which is pronouncedly confessional, there is everywhere the inclination to be very long-suffering in cases where teachers have difficulty in finding themselves in the spirit of the Church's Creed. An honest doubter is always respected. But in cases where a false teacher, in disregard of the life of the Church, uses his influence to gather a following and to make a school, and thus tries to disrupt the Church, long-suffering and forbearance cease to be virtues. The spiritual life of souls is at stake, and therefore the Church is forced to use the Creed as a paragraph for discipline. This is not only legitimate, but it is a plain Christian duty. The Lord Himself warned against false prophets. (Matthew 7:15 ff.) Paul, in departing from Ephesus, charged the elders to be on their guard also against men arising among their "own selves," "speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29-30). To the Romans, he writes: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them" (Acts 16:17)—a charge repeated many times in his letters to Timothy and Titus.

* * *

Regarding this whole movement of endeavoring to unite the adherents of so many conflicting teachings, systems of theology, principles and tendencies into one Church, we

cannot but feel that it is bound to end in failure. The old General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America, at its last convention in Chicago, 1917, after having received the report of Dr. D. H. Bauslin for the representatives that had been sent to one of the preparatory meetings, discontinued its commission. "How can two walk together if they are not agreed?" And as to the attempt of accomplishing the union of so many denominations upon the basis of generalities, studiously avoiding any distinct profession of belief we must say that success in such a movement for Church unity would be a calamity and not a blessing.[15] What a treatment of God's revelation to man that would be! Most of the teachings of Scripture would be relegated into the category of "open questions," and the rich doctrinal experience of the Church would be ignored.

There is only one road to Church union, and that is agreement in the truth of God's Word. This is the position that has always been taken by the Lutheran Church. Outward unity is not necessary, but union in the faith is the goal that we must strive after. May this union come more and more! But let us remember, the Church can fulfill its mission even if the ideal should never be perfectly realized this side of eternity.

---

[15] At the preparatory meeting in Garden City a basis or platform was adopted, which read as follows: "The basis of the proposed world conference is the faith of the whole Church, as itself created by Christ, resting on the Incarnation and continued from age to age by His indwelling life until He comes." Cf. Proceedings of General Synod, 1917, p. 122. We ask: What is the tangible confessional substance of such a paragraph? In the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 also the following is offered as a basis for the reunited Church: "The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ." What does that mean?